

# ORGANISATIONAL JUSTICE: A HOSPITALITY SHIFT WORKER CONTEXTUAL PERSPECTIVE

**Sarah Chan**

University of New South Wales

**Denise Jepsen**

University of Technology, Sydney

## **Abstract**

*Few studies have examined the effect of organisational justice on workplace relationships and attitudes of shift workers. This study uses a full four factor model of organisational justice to investigate justice perceptions of shift workers in the specific hospitality context of employees in registered clubs. Using a social exchange perspective of the employment relationship, responses from a total of 501 employees in three clubs were analysed. Inconsistent results were found across the three clubs on employees' workplace relationships including leader-member exchange (LMX) and perceived organisational support (POS) and their work attitudes of job satisfaction, organisational commitment and their intention to quit. The inconsistent results may be explained by contextual differences including the nature of the industry and work patterns. The findings provide weak support for past justice studies, raising concern about the generalisability of current organisational justice research to both shift workers and the hospitality industry.*

Organisational justice is concerned with employees' perceptions of fairness of work-related issues (Greenberg, 1990). The first justice identified was distributive justice (DJ, Leventhal, 1980) or fairness of the outcome received. Employees compare the ratio of their own inputs and outcomes such as pay and bonuses with relevant others and judge fairness by the match of each party (Adams, 1965).

Procedural justice (PJ) is the fairness by which the decision is made, for example the procedure in which promotion, bonuses and performance ratings are determined. Fairness perceptions are also based on the quality of interpersonal treatment during a procedure (Bies and Moag, 1986; Kickul, Lester, & Finkl, 2002; Niehoff & Moorman, 1993). Interactional justice (IAJ) is the fairness by which decision makers treat employees. IAJ is fostered by decision makers treating employees with respect and sensitivity and thoroughly explaining the rationale for decisions. IAJ is separated into interpersonal (IPJ) and informational (INJ) justice (Colquitt, 2001). IPJ is the treatment received and INJ refers to the adequacy of information provided to employees regarding procedures. The four factor justice was supported by a confirmatory factor analysis (Colquitt, 2001).

*Social exchange theory:* Social exchange theory (SET) suggests an implicit obligation to return a favour after receiving a favour or benefit from another (Blau, 1964). Each party must offer something the other values and each must see the exchange as fair (Homans, 1961). Employees develop an exchange relationship with their supervisor and another with their organisation (Wayne, Shore & Liden, 1997). The supervisor relationship is represented as leader-member exchange (LMX) (Graen & Scandura, 1987), which posits that leaders develop differentiated relationships with subordinates (Dansereau, Graen & Haga, 1975). High quality relationships occur when there is a high level of mutual trust, respect and obligation (Graen & Uhl-Bien, 1995). The organisational SET relationship is represented by perceived organisational support (POS) (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison & Sowa, 1986), or employees' global beliefs concerning the extent to which the organisation values their contribution and cares about their well being. POS is fostered by the frequency, extremity and sincerity of statements of praise and approval. With high POS, employees feel they ought to be committed to their employer by engaging in behaviours that support the organisation in return for the employers' commitment.

*Justice in Social Exchange Theory:* Three studies have examined justice in a social exchange framework. Masterson et al. (2000) used SET to clarify the PJ and IAJ distinction. PJ was found to relate to attitudes associated with POS while IAJ related to attitudes associated with LMX. PJ predicted job satisfaction, commitment and intention to quit. IAJ predicted job satisfaction. This study was extended by Cropanzano et al. (2002) . LMX was more strongly related to IAJ than PJ. Job satisfaction was also more strongly related to IAJ than PJ. Cropanzano et al. (2002) concluded that PJ and IAJ should be distinct as they relate to different social exchange theories and employees' attitudes. Roch and Shanock (2006) used four justices and found PJ related to POS but IPJ and INJ were only related to LMX when considered separately. Their study did not include job satisfaction, commitment or quit intentions.

*Contextual Differences:* Context such as the industry, location and time of study affects organisational behaviour (Johns, 2001; Rousseau & Fried, 2001). Context has affected results in research where the causal arrow between key variables was reversed from well established trends in the literature (Johns, 2006). One context aspect is work pattern. Shift work has different employee impacts to day work. Shift work tends to cause physical problems for workers and hence have a negative impact on job satisfaction (Andresen, Domsch & Cascorbi, 2007). Shift workers perceive their work environment less favourably than comparable day workers (Boggild, Burr, Tuchsén & Jeppesen, 2001). Aside from nursing studies (e.g., Greenberg, 2006), most justice research uses day shift employees. This study aims to use all four justices to explain shift workers' justice and SET relationships in order to extend the generalisability of organisational justice to shift workers. It is hypothesised that there will be:

- H1a:* A positive relationship between procedural justice and POS
- H1b:* A positive relationship between interpersonal justice and LMX

- H1c:* A positive relationship between informational justice and LMX
- H1d:* No relationship between distributive justice and LMX
- H1e:* No relationship between distributive justice and POS

Employee attitudes outcome relationships are hypothesised to be:

- H2a:* Positive between procedural justice and job satisfaction and commitment
- H2b:* Negative between procedural justice and intention to quit. .
- H2c:* Positive between interpersonal and job satisfaction
- H2d:* Positive between informational justice and job satisfaction

## **Method**

*Sample:* A simultaneous multi-site study was conducted using shift workers at three registered clubs. The social, community and hospitality services of the clubs include restaurants, gaming, sporting and catering facilities and services. The clubs differ in that Clubs A and B are located in a multicultural suburb with lower socioeconomic status and higher unemployment rate than Club C in a well established beachside location, implying employee and customer demographic differences. Club sizes differ with Clubs A, B and C having 200, 300 and less than 100 employees each. Clubs A and B have their own management support whereas Club C relies on support from Club B. Club B acquired Club C 40km away some 18 months before the study yet the clubs operate separately. Location, uniform, structure and size differences means Clubs B and C employees are treated as in different organisations.

Respondents from Clubs A, B and C were 166, 300 and 85, of whom 68, 106 and 40 were male, mean age of 35, 34 and 29 with tenure of 5, 4.8 and 3.8 years respectively. There were 39%, 35% and 40% of employees who completed high school or below and 19%, 3% and 8% completed postgraduate study. There were 160, 262 and 79

responses from Clubs A, B and C after removing 51 responses with missing data.

*Organisational justice.* A 20-item measure (Colquitt, 2001) was used. Seven items measure procedural justice (PJ), for example, "Have you been able to express your views and feelings during those procedures?" Four items measure distributive justice (DJ), for example "Are your benefits appropriate for the work you have completed?" Interpersonal justice (IPS) is measured by four items with an example item of "(About your manager) Have they treated you in a polite manner?" Informational justice (INJ) is measured by five items and an example is "Have they been candid in his/her communications with you?" with a five-point Likert scale from "1 = *not at all*" to "5 = *to a great extent*". Cronbach's alphas were .93, .93, .92 and .90 respectively.

*Leader-Member Exchange.* The supervisor-subordinate relationship was measured with Graen and Uhl Bien's (1995) seven-item scale. Respondents rated on a five-point scale with different item anchors. An example item is "How well does your leader understand your problems and needs?" with response selection of "*not a bit*", "*a little*", "*a fair amount*", "*quite a bit*" and "*a great deal*". Cronbach's alpha was .91 *Perceived organisational support.* Nine items from the Survey of Perceived Organisational Support scale (Eisenberger, Huntington, Hutchison and Sowa, 1986) measured POS. An example item is "Management shows very little concern for me." A seven point Likert scale ranging from "1 = *disagree strongly*" to "7 = *agree strongly*" was used for this and all following scales. The score was the average of item scores.

*Job satisfaction.* The job satisfaction scale (Hackman and Oldman, 1975) was used. An example is "I am generally satisfied with the kind of work I do in this job."

*Intention to quit.* Three items were used to measure respondents' intentions to leave. An example item is "I am actively looking for a job outside the Club".

*Organisational commitment.* The affective organisational commitment scale (Allen and Meyer, 1990) was used. An example is “I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career with the club.”

## Results

Descriptive statistics are in Table 1. The correlation matrix supports the hypotheses on the relationship between the justice types and employees’ work relationships. H1a, a positive relationship between PJ and POS, was supported in Clubs A, B and C,  $rs = .52, .56$  and  $.51$  respectively,  $p < .01$ . H1b, a positive relationship between IPJ and LMX, was also supported in Clubs A, B and C,  $rs = .60, .49$  and  $.50$ . H1c, a positive relationship between INJ and LMX, was supported in Clubs A, B and C,  $rs = .66, .49$  and  $.52$ . However, contrary to H1d that there is no relationship between DJ and LMX, the correlation matrix yielded significant results in Clubs A, B and C,  $rs = .47, .36$  and  $.39$ . Similarly, H1e, predicting no relationship between DJ and POS, was not supported. Correlations showed significant DJ and POS relationships in Clubs A, B and C,  $rs = .50, .52$  and  $.47$ . The employees’ attitudes relationships were also supported. H2a was supported in Clubs A, B and C; for job satisfaction  $rs = .38, .43$  and  $.39$  and for commitment  $rs = .29, .30$  and  $.32$ . H2b was supported by the correlation matrix in Clubs A, B and C,  $rs = -.29, -.41$  and  $-.33$ . H2c was supported in Clubs A, B and C,  $r = .49, .46$  and  $.38$ . H2d was also supported in Clubs A, B and C,  $rs = .49, .49$  and  $.36$ .

Given the preliminary support of the correlations results, a series of hierarchical regressions further investigated relationships between the justices and employee attitudes. Step 1 of the regressions included gender, age and tenure and step 2 included the justice types. Table 2 reports the standardised regression results. Results varied. H1a was supported in Club B where PJ significantly predicted POS ( $\beta = .33$ ). Similar results were not found in Clubs A or C ( $\beta < .12, p > .05$ ). H1b was supported in Club B where IPJ predicted LMX ( $\beta = .24$ ), but not in Clubs A or C ( $\beta < .15, p > .05$ ). H1c was

Table 1

*Means, Standard Deviations, Reliabilities, and Intercorrelations for Clubs A, B and C*

	<i>Variable</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>	<i>6</i>	<i>7</i>	<i>8</i>	<i>9</i>
Club A (n =160)	1. Procedural justice	2.85	.89	(.90)								
	2. Distributive justice	2.84	1.07	.78**	(.93)							
	3. Interpersonal justice	3.89	.99	.39**	.36**	(.93)						
	4. Informational justice	3.57	.92	.42**	.41**	.78**	(.91)					
	5. LMX (employee)	3.33	.75	.54**	.47**	.60**	.66**	(.86)				
	6. POS	4.29	1.16	.52**	.50**	.56**	.56**	.63**	(.91)			
	7. Job satisfaction	4.42	1.15	.38**	.45**	.49**	.49**	.55**	.66**	(.79)		
	8. Commitment	2.76	1.12	.29**	.36**	.37**	.44**	.50**	.61**	.56**	(.78)	
	9. Intention to quit	3.17	.93	-.29**	-.32**	-.49**	-.50**	-.57**	-.54**	-.70**	-.57**	(.74)
Club B (n = 262)	1. Procedural justice	2.71	.93	(.92)								
	2. Distributive justice	2.76	1.13	.75**	(.93)							
	3. Interpersonal justice	3.89	.98	.41**	.40**	(.93)						

	4. Informational justice	3.55	1.02	.45**	.41**	.78**	(.94)						
	5. LMX (employee)	3.32	.79	.45**	.36**	.49**	.49**	(.89)					
	6. POS	4.30	1.11	.56**	.52**	.57**	.59**	.59**	(.90)				
	7. Job satisfaction	4.80	1.06	.43**	.45**	.46**	.49**	.45**	.63**	(.77)			
	8. Commitment	4.21	.92	.30**	.23**	.30**	.38**	.36**	.51**	.53**	(.71)		
	9. Intention to quit	2.93	1.43	-.41**	-.35**	-.38**	-.36**	-.37**	-.54**	-.67**	-.50**	(.74)	
Club C (n = 79 )	1. Procedural justice	2.88	1.08										
	2. Distributive justice	2.96	1.20	.84**		(.96)							
	3. Interpersonal justice	4.06	.98	.46**	.38**		(.93)						
	4. Informational justice	3.70	1.14	.50**	.47**	.80**		(.95)					
	5. LMX (employee)	3.80	.70	.43**	.39**	.50**	.52**		(.89)				
	6. POS	4.69	1.30	.51**	.47**	.65**	.73**	.42**		(.92)			
	7. Job Satisfaction	4.77	1.08	.39**	.38**	.38**	.36**	.35**	.48**		(.76)		
	8. Commitment	4.12	1.07	.32**	.29*	.32**	.31**	.33**	.39**	.39**		(.77)	
	9. Intention to quit	3.29	1.55	-.33**	-.29**	-.30**	-.21	-.39**	-.40**	-.74**	-.50**		(.74)



Table 2

*Hierarchical Regression Results for Job Satisfaction (JS), Organisational Commitment (OC,) Intention to Quit (ITQ), Leader-Member Exchange (LMX) and Perceived Organisational Support (POS)*

Variable	Club A					Club B					Club C				
	JS	OC	ITQ	LMX	POS	JS	OC	ITQ	LMX	POS	JS	OC	ITQ	LMX	POS
Step 1: Demographics															
Gender	-.07	-.12	.15	-.07	-.25**	.02	-.05	.03	.04	.05	.07	.15	-.06	-.14	.20
Age	.22	.20*	-.10	.07	.11	.16*	.15	-.27**	.04	.16*	-.23	.13	.07	.13	.00
Tenure	.04	.29**	-.21	.10	.12	-.08	.01	.06	.01	-.05	.45**	.38	-.40**	.16	-.02
<i>R</i>	.24	.41	.28	.14	.29	.14	.17	.25	.05	.14	.36	.53	.38	.28	.20
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	.06	.17	.08	.02	.08	.02	.03	.06	.00	.02	.13	.28	.14	.08	.04
Adjusted <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	.03	.15	.06	.00	.61	.00	.02	.05	-.01	.01	.09	.25	.10	.04	.00

Variable	Club A					Club B					Club C				
	JS	OC	ITQ	LMX	POS	JS	OC	ITQ	LMX	POS	JS	OC	ITQ	LMX X	POS
Step 2: Justice Types															
Gender	.01	-.06	.06	.05	-.15*	.01	-.04	.05	.02	.03	.06	.13	-.06	-.18	.19*
Age	.26**	.24**	-.12	.06	.13	.09	.13	-.24**	.00	.10	-.27	.16	.12	.17	.00
Tenure	.03	.27**	-.19*	.07	.11	-.03	.03	.04	.05	.00	.41**	.33*	-.38*	.06	-.14
Procedural Justice	-.11	-.20	.07	.21	.09	.16	.34**	-.35**	.27**	.33**	.05	.09	-.06	.19	.11
Distributive Justice	.49**	.42**	-.21	.10	.33**	.14	-.22*	.06	.01	.07	.10	.03	-.11	.01	.03
Interpersonal Justice	.17	.13	-.23	.14	.21	.19*	.01	-.28**	.24*	.25**	.31	.02	-.33	.04	.26
Informational Justice	.14	.19	-.20	.40**	.15	.20*	.33**	.00	.16	.20*	.00	.18	.17	.41*	.49**
<i>R</i>	.64	.63	.56	.71	.70	.58	.48	.55	.56	.72	.53	.59	.48	.62	.81
<i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	.41	.40	.31	.51	.48	.34	.23	.30	.32	.52	.28	.35	.23	.39	.65
Adjusted <i>R</i> <sup>2</sup>	.37	.37	.27	.48	.45	.32	.20	.27	.30	.50	.20	.28	.14	.39	.61
$\Delta R^2$	.35**	.24*	.24*	.49**	.40**	.32**	.20**	.24**	.32**	.50**	.15*	.07	.09	.31**	.61**

\*  $p < .05$ . \*\*  $p < .01$ .

supported in Clubs A and C where INJ predicted LMX ( $\beta$ s = .40 and .41) but not in Club B ( $\beta$  = .16,  $p > .05$ ). H1d and 1e were supported in Clubs B and C where DJ did not predict LMX (both  $\beta$ s = .01,  $p > .05$ ) and POS ( $\beta < .08$ ,  $p > .05$ ) but not in Club A where DJ predicted POS ( $\beta$  = .33). The second hypotheses were analysed. H2a was only partially supported by PJ positively predicting commitment in Club B ( $\beta$  = .34) but not in Clubs A and C ( $\beta$ s = -.20 and .09,  $p > .05$ ). Further contradicting H2a, PJ did not predict job satisfaction in any club ( $\beta < .17$ ,  $p > .05$ ). H2b was also partially supported by PJ negatively predicting quit intentions in Club B ( $\beta$  = -.35) but not Clubs A and C ( $\beta$ s = .07 and -.06,  $p > .05$ ). Similarly, H2c and H2d were partially supported by IPJ and INJ positively predicting job satisfaction in Club B ( $\beta$ s = .19 and .20) but not in Clubs A or C ( $\beta$ s = .07 and -.06,  $p > .05$ ).

## Discussion

The study examined the relationships between all four justice types and important employee attitudes simultaneously in three samples of hospitality shift workers. There were two groups of hypotheses tested. The first group examined organisational justice relationships within a social exchange framework while the second group examined justice relationships with the important employee cognitive outcomes of job satisfaction, organisational commitment and intention to quit. The results provide only weak support for prior justice studies as none of the hypotheses were fully supported. Adding further complexity, although many of the results were the same in two samples, none were consistent across all three samples. The study has extended organisational justice research in two ways. First, the study has extended the study of organisational justice to hospitality shift workers and second, subtle contextual differences emerged across the three apparently-similar samples.

*Theoretical Implications:* The general lack of support for the hypotheses – only 12 out of a possible 30 relationships were supported – suggests the hospitality respondents in this study may

differ from respondents more usually studied in organisational justice research. Studies examining justice and workplace relationships have often been conducted in a university setting, for example (Cropanzano et al., 2002; Masterson et al., 2000; Roch & Shanock, 2006). University respondents are usually well educated with a high proportion of employees with tertiary education. In contrast, the current study examined organisational justice and workplace relationships in the hospitality industry. The part time, casual or contingent nature of many hospitality jobs means many employees in these roles are less educated than employees in a more stable professional environment such as a university. As a result, hospitality employees may have different expectations of organisational justice and may also have different perceptions of their workplace relationships. The proportion of respondents in the current study with at least a graduate degree ranged from 13% in Club B to a similar 31% and 25% in Clubs A and C respectively. Of course many hospitality industry workers are students who have yet to complete their degrees.

The alternative and perhaps more likely explanation concerns the nature of shift work. Most justice research has been conducted in industries where employees work stable hours. Procedural justice has generally been found to predict job satisfaction (Cropanzano et al., 2002; Masterson et al., 2000) yet only one out of three samples in the current study generated that result. This inconsistency may be explained by differences between day and shift workers and the types of roles in which shift workers are engaged. Shift work tends to cause physical strains for many workers and hence have a negative impact on employees' job satisfaction (Andresen, Domsch & Cascorbi, 2007). The physicality of the work is true of the hospitality industry in which this study was conducted. Employees in all three sites often remain standing working in the bars and restaurants for long periods, which may produce physical strains and have adverse effects on health. Hence, shift workers may be less satisfied with their jobs regardless of their perception of the organisation's fairness.

*Within-industry differences:* The research context is well known to affect organisational behaviour and has resulted in reversed findings of well established trends (Johns, 2001, 2006; Rousseau & Fried, 2001). However, even within the single industry context the three studies yielded inconsistent results. This inconsistency within the industry suggests that the relationships under investigation are moderated not just by industry but by more specific contextual differences. For example, all three organisations differ in their location, the types of employees they attract, their organisational structure, and their organisational culture. While there may be some similarities, it would be expected also that management style and human resources practices would vary in each organisation.

With respect to the hypothesised social exchange relationships, the significant relationships expected between procedural justice and POS and between interpersonal justice and LMX were found in only one of the three samples. The sample in which these relationships were significant was Club B. The samples in which informational justice significantly predicted LMX, however, excluded Club B. With respect to the justice effects on employee attitudes, a similar pattern of distinctive Club B results emerged. Four out of the five relationships in the second hypothesis were supported in Club B only. Finally, the results from Clubs B and C – owned by the same parent group – agreed that distributive justice did not significantly predict LMX or POS.

The distinctive feature of Club B in this study is the sample size, with 262 respondents compared with 160 and 79 respondents for Clubs A and C respectively. It is plausible therefore that the way the results for Clubs A and C differ from the Club B results may suggest there are other forces at play in the two smaller organisations that have not emerged in prior organisational justice studies. The tendency for organisational behaviour research to be conducted in larger organisations may have not only skewed the samples collected to favour larger organisations but perhaps has limited our thinking in how we expect employees to behave. This speculation that the size of Club B aligns it more closely to the more frequently-

researched corporate organisation prompts further speculation. It may be that the corporate ownership of Clubs B and C may account for the predicted lack of relationship between distributive justice and both LMX and POS. There is a policy-led wage setting strategy for both Clubs B and C prescribed by upper management. It would appear that like respondents in past studies, employees in those two organisations do not extend their wages perception (distributive justice) to their social exchange relationships with their manager (LMX) or the organisation (POS).

*Practical Implications:* These findings have considerable practical implications for human resources practitioners and managers in the hospitality industry. As many would already be aware, the role of specific context is important when considering the effects of organisational justice on employees' relationships and attitudes. That is, imposing a strategy that is effective in one location or organisation may not produce the same effect in another location or organisation, even within the same industry. Organisations often engage in benchmarking their own practices with others of the same industry. However, it is important that hospitality human resources practitioners and managers recognise, understand and acknowledge the specific organisational context is important before implementing borrowed practices into their own organisation. For best practice, strategies should be tailored to the context and the specific needs of the organisation.

Context is also important for organisations that are undertaking merger and acquisitions. Club B acquired Club C 18 months prior the study and have imposed a series of Club B policies on Club C. The two clubs yielded different results – only two out of ten pairs of results were the same – further supporting the argument that strategies should be tailored to individual organisations rather than simply imposing existing practices. The acquired organisation may have had a different culture and structure. A detailed understanding of such culture and structure is needed and will increase the chances of success in the change processes during the merge.

The study's limitations are acknowledged. The study was cross-sectional and so the results do not imply causality for which a longitudinal study is needed. The findings may not have provided a complete account of the investigated relationships. Other factors such as physical strain, work stress and lack of social interaction may affect shift workers' work perception (Parkes, 2003) and a closer examination of these factors would provide a more comprehensive model. The diverse findings of the three samples may be further explained if data on the similarities and differences in their human resource practices had been collected. Last, the study relied on self reports that may be inflated due to common method variance (Spector, 2006).

This study confirms that context – in particular, hospitality industry and shift work patterns – affects the relationship between the four organisational justices and employees' relationships and attitudes. Future research could continue to explore the effect of context in organisational justice perceptions, particularly the effect of POS and LMX as mediators between organisational justice and employees' attitudes. The study of mediating effects may provide a more thorough understanding of the interactions between organisational justice and employees' relationships and attitudes. The study raises the important question of the generalisability of organisational justice research to the specific context of the hospitality industry. It is apparent that the findings of one location or organisation cannot be generalised to another, even within the same industry. The context of a study should be considered when interpreting results. Irrespective of the context, however, hospitality industry managers are advised to attend to all four types of organisational justice in implementing human resource policies, procedures and practices. Paying attention to the subtle aspects of how employees are rewarded and communicated with can improve employees' perceptions of their employer and consequently improve employment relationships.

## References

- Adams, J. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 2. pp 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- Allen, N., & Meyer, J. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63, 1-18.
- Andresen, M., Domsch, M., & Cascorbi, A. (2007). Working unusual hours and its relationship to job satisfaction: a study of European maritime pilots. *Journal of Labor Research*, 28, 714-734.
- Bies, R., & Moag, J. (1986). Interactional justice: communication criteria for fairness. In B. Sheppard (Ed.), *Research on negotiation in organizations* (Vol. 1. pp. 43-55). Greenwich: JAI.
- Blau, P. (1964). *Exchanges and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley.
- Boggild, H., Burr, H., Tuchsén, F., & Jeppesen, H. (2001). Work environment of Danish shift and day workers. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 27, 97-105.
- Colquitt, J. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 386-400.
- Cropanzano, R., Prehar, C., & Chen, P. (2002). Using social exchange theory to distinguish procedural from interactional justice. *Group & Organization Management*, 27, 324-351.
- Dansereau, F., Graen, G., & Haga, W. (1975). A vertical dyad linkage approach to leadership within formal organizations: a longitudinal investigation of the role making process. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 13, 46-78.
- Eisenberger, R., Fasolo, P., & Davis-LaMastro, V. (1990). Perceived organizational support and employee diligence, commitment and innovation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 75, 51-59.
- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71, 500-507.



- Graen, G., & Scandura, T. (1987). Toward a psychology of dyadic organizing. In L. L. Cummings & B. M. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior* (Vol 9. pp 175-208). Greenwich: JAI Press.
- Graen, G., & Uhl-Bien, M. (1995). Relationship-based approach to leadership: Development of leader-member exchange (LMX) theory of leadership over 25 years: Applying a multi-level multi domain perspective. *Leadership Quarterly*, 62, 219-247.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational justice: Yesterday, today, tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16, 399-432.
- Greenberg, J. (2006). Losing sleep over organizational injustice: Attenuating insomniac reactions to underpayment inequity with supervisory training in interactional justice. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 58-69.
- Hackman, J., & Oldman, G. (1975). Development of the job diagnostic survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60, 159-170.
- Homans, C. (1961). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. New York: Brace & World.
- Johns, G. (2001). In praise of context. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22, 31-42.
- Johns, G. (2006). The essential impact of context on organizational behavior. *Academy of Management Review*, 31, 386-408.
- Kickul, J., Lester, S. W., & Finkl, J. (2002). Promise breaking during radical organizational change: Do justice interventions make a difference? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 23(4), 469.
- Leventhal, G. (1980). What should be done with equity theory? New approaches to the study of fairness in social relationships. In K. Gergen, M. Greenberg, & R. Willis (Eds.), *Social exchange: Advances in theory and research* (pp. 27-55). New York: Plenum Press.
- Masterson, S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B., & Taylor, M. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 738-748.
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational

- citizenship behavior. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36(3), 527.
- Parkes, K. (2003). Shiftwork and environment as interactive predictors of work perceptions. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 8, 266-281.
- Peter, R., Alfredsson, L., Knutsson, A., Siegrist, J., & Westerholm, P. (1999). Does a stressful psychosocial work environment mediate the effects of shift work on cardiovascular risk factors? *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 25, 376–381.
- Roch, S., & Shanock, L. (2006). Organizational justice in an exchange framework: Clarifying organizational justice distinctions. *Journal of Management*, 32, 299-322.
- Rousseau, D., & Fried, Y. (2001). Location, location, location: Contextualizing organizational research. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 22, 1-13.
- Spector, P. (2006). Method variance in organizational research: Truth or urban legend? *Organizational Research Methods*, 9, 221-232.
- Wayne, S., Shore, L., & Liden, R. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40, 82-111.



**IERA**  
International  
Employment Relations  
Association

**IERA 2009 17<sup>th</sup> Annual Conference**  
**July 2009, Bangkok**

*Conference Theme:*  
*Advancing the Quality of HRM & HRD in the*  
*Global Economy*

**BOOK OF PROCEEDINGS**

Edited by Julia Connell, Denise Jepsen, Robyn Johns and  
Keri Spooner

Conference convened jointly by  
School of Management, Mahidol University, Bangkok  
and University of Technology, Sydney

**ISBN 978-0-9750131-9-9**

# **ADVANCING THE QUALITY OF HRM AND HRD IN THE GLOBAL ECONOMY**

## **PREFACE**

As the globalisation of markets continues at a rapid pace, the challenges for HR managers and those teaching HR increase. Human Resource Management practices vary between countries, sector, size and ownership of organizations. As a result it is important to acknowledge that what are largely considered to be 'Western' style HRM practices may not be relevant in other cultures. Despite this, some lessons may be learned from organizational experiences that can be transferred across countries and cultures through globalisation.

Globalisation is used to define a combination of factors - a single market place with growing free trade among nations; the increasing flow and sharing of information; and connections and opportunities for organisations and people to interact around the world without being constrained by national boundaries. To date globalisation has been a prime force for spreading knowledge through technology. Knowledge about production methods, management techniques, export markets, and economic policies is available at very low cost, and this knowledge represents a valuable resource for both developed and developing countries. It has been suggested that the HRD profession must include not only economic development and workplace learning, but it must also be committed to the political, social, environmental, cultural, and spiritual development of people around the world, particularly, as global success depends on utilizing the resources and diverse talents and capabilities of the broadest possible spectrum of humanity.

This conference draws from the research and experiences of participants to provide lessons and examples regarding how some organizations and individuals are attempting to utilise HRM strategies in order to promote agility and excellence and, in some cases, globalise business through such diverse topics as:

- HRD and HRM policy
- Organisational culture and power
- ER processes: collective and individual
- Community resource development
- HRM outcomes: empowerment, job satisfaction and productivity
- Workplace learning
- Values, politics, power, ethics and HRD
- Employment relations at public policy level
- HR and corporate sustainability
- Leadership and other areas.

The papers presented in these Proceedings have all been subject to peer referee by two reviewers with comments offered to authors.

The conference organisers would like to take this opportunity to sincerely thank the College of Management at Mahidol University for generously hosting this 17th Annual Conference of IERA. We also wish to express our thanks to the University of Technology, Sydney for its financial and administrative support of the conference. Special thanks to Virginia Furse, who worked tirelessly to produce these Proceedings and other materials critical to the success of the conference

The Conference Organisers are sure this 17<sup>th</sup> IERA Conference will be a rich and rewarding learning experience for everyone involved. We look forward to welcoming you to Bangkok.

IERA 2009 Conference Committee  
June 2009

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

Organisational Justice: A Hospitality Shift Worker Contextual Perspective <i>Sarah Chan and Denise Jepsen</i> .....	1
Impact of Individual Characteristics and Cultural Values on Citizenship and Task Performance: Experience of Non-Academic Employees of Universities <i>Anil Chandrakumara and Subashini Senevirathne</i> .....	19
Global Financial Tsunami: Can the Industrial Relations Mechanism Save Singapore this Time Around? <i>Rosalind Chew</i> .....	39
Australian Call Centres: Time to Search for a New Management Model? <i>Julia Connell, Zeenobyah Hannif and John Burgess</i> .....	53
Politicisation and Managerial Values: Responses from New Zealand Councillors <i>Ali Haidar, Mike Reid and Keri Spooner</i> .....	71
Differential Ethical Attitudes Predict the Quality of Leadership Relationships <i>Denise Jepsen, Don Hine and Ray Cooksey</i> .....	91
The Association between Learning Styles and Preferred Teaching Styles <i>Denise M. Jepsen, Melinda M. Varhegyi and Stephen T.T. Teo</i> ....	108
Taking International Students Seriously <i>Robyn Johns and Stella Ng</i> .....	126
Identifying Vision Realization Factors at a Thai State Enterprise <i>Sooksan Kantabutra and Molraudee Saratun</i> .....	145
Termination of Employment in Australia <i>Brian O'Neill</i> .....	158

The History of Welfare and Paid Maternity Leave in Australia <i>Marjorie O'Neill and Robyn Johns</i> .....	172
Antecedents of Affective Organisational Commitment: A Study of State-Owned Enterprise Employees in Thailand <i>Parisa Rungruang and Jessada N. Tangchitnob</i> .....	197
How Training Advances the Quality of Unions: Case Studies in Indonesia and Malaysia <i>Aryana Satrya and Balakrishnan Parasuraman</i> .....	216
Framework for Assessing the Quality of Quality Management Programs <i>Fawzy Soliman and Ahmed Mehrez</i> .....	237
Director Succession Planning and Board Effectiveness in Nonprofit Boards <i>Melinda M. Varhegyi and Denise M. Jepsen</i> .....	249
Undergraduate Student Aspirations, Awareness and Knowledge of Postgraduate Study Options: A Preliminary, Qualitative Investigation <i>Melinda M. Varhegyi and Denise M. Jepsen</i> .....	266